

TERMS.

Published every Saturday, at \$3 in advance, or \$4 at the end of the year. No paper discontinued but at the option of the editors until all arrearages are paid—and a failure to give notice (before the end of the year) of a wish to discontinue will be considered a new engagement.

RATES OF ADVERTISING.

One dollar per square, of twelve lines or less for the first insertion, and fifty cents a square for each subsequent insertion.

Where the insertion of an advertisement is ordered, without the number of insertions being specified, it will be inserted, (at the discretion of the proprietors) until forbid, and charged for accordingly.

All advertisements from strangers, as well as all orders for job-work, must be accompanied with the cash, or a reference to some responsible and convenient acquaintance.

AUTHORIZED AGENTS.

Wm. D. MALONE, Huntsville, Randolph co.
N. B. COATES, " "

Speech of Mr. Stewart, of Penn.

IN DEFENCE OF
THE TARIFF AND DISTRIBUTION.

Delivered in the House of Representatives of the U. S., March, 13, 1844.

[CONCLUDED.]

But, sir, if more revenue is wanted, why not increase the duties on luxuries consumed by the rich, rather than strike down the poor man's labor, and take the bread from the mouth of his children, to make room for the importation of fifty millions of dollars worth of foreign goods? Is this, sir, an American measure, can it receive the support of an American Congress, or the representatives of the American people? I call on the authors of this ruinous measure to come forth in its defence. I call on them to assign some reason for its adoption. I can readily discover reasons enough why England should desire its adoption, but they are the very reasons why we should reject it; just so far as it benefits them it injures us; this is a contest between foreign and American mechanics, farmers, and manufacturers, for the American market, and the question is, which side shall we take? The tariff of 1842 shuts out the foreigner and gives the Americans the market; this bill proposes to repeal the tariff of 1842, and give it to the foreigner; to open our ports and again flood our country with foreign goods, and export money by ship-loads to pay for them; and why? I again ask the committee upon what principle of national policy this measure is sustained?

The Tariff Democratic—Free Trade Monarchical.

Mr. Dromgoole replied to enable bare-headed people to buy cheap hats!

To enable bare-headed people to buy cheap hats! Sir, let me tell the gentleman if he carries this measure, the poor people of this country would not only go bare-headed but bare-backed; they would be doomed, like the paupers of Europe, to go half fed and half clad. The tariff, sir, is "the poor man's law"; it is this and this alone that gives him employment and wages. Just as the tariff goes down, the wages of labor will go down with it. Repeal the tariff—adopt the gentleman's favorite plan of "free-trade," and you will bring down the labor here, in every department of industry, to the level of the labor of the serfs and paupers of Europe. This is certain—it is inevitable. As certain as the laws of gravitation—as inevitable as that the removal of an obstruction between two unequal bodies of water, will reduce the one to the level of the other. Repeal the tariff, and what is there to prevent our country from being instantly inundated with the productions of the low priced labor of Europe. When hatters, shoemakers, blacksmiths, and all must come down and work as cheap as they do, or give up the market! With the present facilities of intercourse by steamships, you might as well attempt to establish higher wages and higher prices on one side of a street than on the other, as to establish and sustain higher prices and wages here than in Europe, under the delusive and Eutopian scheme of "free-trade." But, sir, this scheme would bring in its train other and more fearful consequences. Adopt this scheme, and you will soon bring down and degrade the now free and prosperous labor of this country, not only to the moral, but to the political condition of the slaves and serfs of Europe. By reducing their wages, you deprive the poor man of the means of educating his children and fitting them to be free. By thus depressing one class of your people, you necessarily elevate another. You divide society horizontally into upper and lower classes—distinctions and titles supervene—jealousies and finally hostilities follow, and liberty itself is in the end swallowed up in monarchy. Such are the political and moral tendencies of every step in the direction of free trade. The protective policy is therefore democratic in its character and tendencies, it is a policy which promotes equality, not by depressing one class, but by elevating all—by elevating, sustaining, and protecting the labor of your own country against the ruinous and degrading effects of a too free competition with the low priced and depressed labor of Europe. These are views which belong to this subject, and should not be overlooked or disregarded by those who represent the free labor of this country, and especially by those who make professions of democracy and love of the people. Now is the time, and this is the question, to test their sincerity. Those who represent slaves may be excused, but those representing free-men will be held to a strict accountability.

The duties added to the price, not true.

The great and leading objection to the protective policy is, that the duties are added to the price, and paid by consumers. This objection lies at the foundation of the opposition to this policy; and, if unfounded, this opposition ought to cease. The duty

BOON'S LICK TIMES.

"ERROR CEASES TO BE DANGEROUS, WHEN REASON IS LEFT FREE TO COMBAT IT."—JEFFERSON.

Vol. 5.

FAYETTE, MISSOURI, SATURDAY, MAY 4, 1844.

No. 8.

is added to the price; this is the theory. Now, sir, how is the fact; what says experience? All experience proves that this objection has no existence, save in the imaginations of those who make it.

Now, sir, I lay it down as a general proposition, that there never was a high protective duty imposed upon any article, from the foundation of this Government to the present day, the price of which has not been in the end reduced—greatly reduced—in many instances to one-half, one third, and one-fourth of what it had been before these protective duties were imposed. This, sir, may seem to gentlemen on the other side to be a strong declaration; but, sir, I make it deliberately, with a full conviction of its truth, and I challenge gentlemen to disprove it—I defy them to point out a single instance to the contrary. Let them examine, and they will find invariably that, wherever the duties have been highest, the prices have ultimately come down the lowest, and for a very obvious reason—high duties promote competition, and competition never fails to bring down prices. This effect is invariable and universal; but unfortunately the duties always run up as the prices run down; hence the frightful lists of duties exhibited by the Committee of Ways and Means, amounting to 200, 300, and 400 per cent. When first imposed these duties were but 30 or 40 per cent; but now, owing to the reduction of prices, they have run up to 200 or 300 per cent. By way of illustration take the article of glass, on which a duty of \$4 a box was imposed at a time when glass cost \$12; this was then a duty of 33 per cent., but now when home competition, induced by this protective duty, has brought down the price to \$2 a box, the duty, owing to this reduction of price, is 200 per cent. instead of 33; the same is true of many other articles on which the duty, when imposed, did not exceed 20 or 30 per cent., but now, owing to reduction of price produced by home competition, they amount to 2 or 300 per cent. When four cents per pound duty was put on cut nails, the price was twelve cents per pound, and this duty, of course, was 33 per cent.; but now, when the effect of this protective duty has been to reduce the price of nails from twelve to three cents per pound, the duty is increased to 100 per cent.; this is equally true of spikes, rods, wood screws, &c. Again: eight cents a yard duty was imposed on coarse cottons when imported at 20 cents, being a duty of 40 per cent., but now, when the price has come down to five cents per yard, the duty goes up to 160 per cent.

Sir, I could go on and enumerate more than twenty such instances where the duties, though moderate when imposed, now actually exceed the price of the article; yet we are told that in all cases the duty is added to the price, and paid by the consumer! That is, that the consumer pays \$4 a box duty on glass that he buys for \$2; 4 cents a pound on nails that he buys for 3; and 8 cents a yard on coarse cotton goods that he buys for 5. Such are the absurdities into which these state anti-tariff theories involve their votaries; but suppose what they allege were true in point of fact, and that the duty is really added to the price, the cost of cotton goods being 20 cents when the duty of 8 cents was imposed, added the duty, the price would be, of course, 28 cents a yard, and the duty only 28 per cent. instead of 160 as stated by the committee; hence, if you raise the price five fold, then the duty is quite reasonable, and there will be no objection whatever to its payment. Let the manufacturer, then, run up his price from 5 to 25 cents a yard, and he at once silences all the objections of the Committee of Ways and Means, as this would fix the duty at 30 per cent., just what they want it. But suppose the manufacturer were to reduce his price to one cent a yard, then the duty, being 8 cents, would be 800 per cent. Horrid oppression! who would submit to pay a duty of 800 per cent? Who could then refuse to go with the Committee of Ways and Means for reducing such enormous duties?

Absurdities of the Report.

But the Committee of Ways and Means say that the object of this bill is to increase the revenue by reducing the duties; yet, in the very same paragraph, they say, that should the revenue be found redundant, to avoid the horrid evils of deposits or distribution among the States, the duties should be instantly reduced, so as to reduce the revenue to the wants of the Government; at this time, the committee say, there is not revenue enough, and they propose to increase it by reducing the duties; but should it turn out that there is too much, then they say reduce it by reducing the duties. Thus a reduction of duties is alike effectual with the committee for a reduction or for an increase of revenue. Excellent disciples of Dr. Sangrado, who had but one remedy for all diseases, "bleeding and warm water." How such a palpable contradiction is to be reconciled or explained I am at a loss to conjecture.

The committee proceed next to say that it is the true policy of every interest in the country, except manufacturers, to advocate the proposed reduction of duties, and they especially name agriculture. Now, sir, in my opinion the reverse of this proposition is true; agriculture is much more interested in the maintenance of the present protective tariff than the manufacturer, and for the most obvious reasons: high protective duties are calculated to induce increased investment in manufactures; the effect of this is clearly to increase the demand for the raw material and bread stuffs produced by the farmers; and the necessary

consequence of this increased demand is to increase the price of every thing the farmer has to sell, and, by increasing the quantity, reduce the price of manufactured goods. Thus the protective policy enables the farmers to sell higher and buy lower; while, on the other hand, increased competition obliges the manufacturer to sell lower and buy his supplies at higher rates; yet it is asserted in this report, and in every anti-tariff speech, that high protective duties are imposed for the benefit of the manufacturer at the expense of the farmer. Now I submit whether practically the opposite of this proposition is not the truth; and whether such is not the necessary and unavoidable result of the great laws of demand and supply which regulate and control prices throughout the world.

But agriculture is still further benefited by the protective policy. By increasing manufactures, it withdraws a portion of the capital and hands from agriculture, and converts them into consumers instead of producers, thus diminishing the quantity and increasing the demand for agricultural supplies, and at the same time increasing the supply and reducing the price of the manufactured goods which they get in exchange. Thus, in every point of view in which the subject can be considered, the farmer is more benefited than the manufacturer by the adoption and maintenance of the protective policy. By way of illustration—suppose in a village there is one manufacturing establishment of woollen goods; here the surrounding farmers sell their wool and other agricultural supplies; the manufacturer, having a monopoly, regulates his own prices, as well as those of the farmers, he demands what he pleases, and gives what he will; but suppose a high protective tariff on woollen goods is passed, and instead of one woollen factory there springs into existence five or six in this village, the existing monopoly is at once destroyed; there is six times the demand for wool and provisions; this increased demand necessarily increases the price of every thing the farmer has to sell, and by glutting the market with six times the quantity of woollen goods the price is necessarily reduced. Such are the plain and obvious benefits of the protective policy to the farmers; yet politicians would have them believe that they are oppressed and ruined by this policy, which can alone render them prosperous.

Mr. Van Buren's opinions on the Tariff.

And here, sir, it may not be improper to remark, that Mr. Van Buren entirely concurs with the Committee of Ways and Means. In his letter to the Indiana convention he says: "The great body of mechanics and laborers in every branch of business, whose welfare should be an object of unceasing solicitude on the part of every public man, have been the greatest sufferers by our high protective tariff, and would continue so to be were that policy persisted in, is to my mind too clear to require further elucidation;" but he further says, what is much nearer the truth, that high duties are injurious to the manufacturers themselves, for whose especial benefit we are told by the committee these high duties are imposed. Mr. Van Buren says: "Excess of duties, which tempt to an undue and ruinous investment of capital in their business, is injurious to the manufacturers;" and how—by promoting competition, and reducing prices! but is not this for the benefit of the consumers?

But this is not all Mr. Van Buren says against the protective policy—he says, "the period has passed away when a protective tariff can be kept up in this country," that the tariff "increases the poor man's taxes in an inverse ratio to his ability to pay," and that direct taxation is a more equal and just system of revenue than duties on foreign goods. These, sir, are Mr. Van Buren's opinions upon the tariff, as claimed to the world in his Indiana letter.

But let us look into the details and practical operation of this bill on the great agricultural, manufacturing, and mechanical interests of our country.

In the first place it greatly reduces the duties on wool and woollens of all kinds; three-fourths of the duties, and more, are taken from coarse cottons and calicoes; lead is robbed of more than nine-tenths of its protection. But Pennsylvania seems to be singled out for destruction. Her iron, her coal, her glass, her paper, her salt, and leather, are all struck down together, and we are to go to England for iron, coal, glass, &c. Yes, sir, in 1842 we imported more than four millions of bushels of coal, under a duty of \$1.75 per ton. This bill reduces it to one dollar. Of course you must double, and doubtless you will treble the quantity imported; and for what? To increase the revenue. A few days ago Pennsylvania passed a resolution unanimously instructing us to go for protection "without regard to revenue." Yes, sir, these are the words, protection "without regard to revenue;" and here we are reversing the rule, going for a bill for revenue without regard to protection; voting for 20,000 copies of a report in favor of this anti-tariff, anti-American, and British bill.

But this bill greatly, very greatly, reduces the duties on whiskey, brandy, gin, and wine. We must import whiskey and brandy for revenue, and give the rich their wine at one half the present duty, and they must of course drink double the quantity or we lose revenue. What say you temperance men to this? You must all get drunk on foreign spirits to increase the revenue. Tax the poor by direct State taxation, and let the rich indulge in wine, brandy, silks, and laces, at lower rates!

No, put the duties high on luxuries, and distribute the proceeds of the land among the States to relieve the poor from taxation. Sir, pass this bill to lighten the burdens of the rich, while you double the burdens, reduce the wages, and destroy the labor of mechanics and the poor, and go home and hear what they have to say on the subject.

The following abstract from table C, in the appendix to the report of the committee, will show the practical operation of this bill upon the mechanical, agricultural, and manufacturing interests of the country:

Names of articles.	Present duties.	Proposed duties.
EFFECT UPON MECHANICS.	Per cent.	Per cent.
Clothing, ready made by tailors.	30	30
Mits, caps, binding and history.	30	30
Umbrellas, parasols and sun shades.	30	25
Silk hats, bonnets, &c.	55	25
Hat bodies.	43	30
Hats and bonnets of vegetable substances.	35	25
Children's boots and shoes.	30	20
India rubber shoes.	30	30
Locks.	188	30
Utensils of cordage.	60	30
Iron cables or chains.	82	30
Cut and wrought spikes.	43	30
Cut nails.	43	30
Brazed kettles, (hammered).	30	25
Japaned, plated, and gilt ware.	30	25
Cutlery of all kinds.	30	25
Sole leather.	53	25
Calf skins.	37	25
Bricks and paving tiles.	25	15
Metal buttons.	30	25
Hard soap.	51	30
China ware.	30	20
EFFECT UPON FARMERS.		
Wheat.	35	25
Beef and pork.	120	25
Cheese.	70	25
Vinegar.	64	25
Pearl or bulled barley.	67	30
Wheat or fish oil.	44	30
Wool costing over 7 cts per lb.	3c. pr. lb. off.	
Linseed oil.	43	30
Spirits from grain, 1st proof.	132	42*
Brandy, &c., from other materials.	180	38
Coal, per ton.	\$1.75	\$1.00
EFFECT UPON MANUFACTURERS.		
Wool, all manufactures of.	40	30
Carpetings, treble grain.	87	30
Brussels.	42	30
Venetian.	45	30
Other Ingrain.	46	30
Coarse cottons, (being a reduction of three-fourths).	120	30
Cotton bagging.	53	30
Oil cloth furniture.	62	30
other kinds.	54	30
Iron, bolts and bars.	77	41
rail-road.	72	56
Pigs.	56	30
mail and spike rods.	56	30
vessels cast.	45	30
wood screws.	63	30
Steel, cast, shear and German.	36	21
Glass, cut.	186	30
window, 8 by 10.	62	30
12 by 16.	165	30
Lead, pigs and bars.	86	30
Gunpowder.	51	30

The 12th section of the bill provides that, after the 1st of September, 1845, all the duties above 25 per cent. is to be reduced to that horizontal standard, 25 per cent.

In 1842, we imported more than four millions of gallons of wine, and nearly two million gallons of distilled spirits. England imposes 2,700 per cent. duty on our whiskey, and we, by way of reciprocity, now propose to reduce our duties on English and Irish whiskey (1,650,000 gallons of which, with other distilled spirits, was imported in 1842) to a mere nominal duty! The duty of 25 cents on wheat would also be affected. This bill brings all duties above 30 per cent.—a horizontal tariff, except on a few specific articles; and in one year more, it brings the duties down to 25 per cent., discriminating for revenue below that standard. This was bringing it nearly down to Mr. Van Buren's standard, established in his famous Indiana letter. His maximum 25 per cent. till the debt was paid, and then 20 per cent., discriminating for revenue below that amount, but in no case above it for protection. This was Mr. Van Buren's plan, as laid down in that letter, to which he referred gentlemen who might be disposed to doubt it.

[Here Mr. S. was interrupted by a call to order from a Van Buren man.]

Mr. S. said gentlemen seemed very solicitous about order when their favorite men and measures were assailed, but nothing was out of order when it suited their purpose. Why was not the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Duncan) called to order, when, on a bill to fix the time of holding elections, he had introduced a coon, a dead coon, and had dissected it professionally, discussed it scientifically, inside and out; he had introduced all the whig banners and flags of the campaign of 1840, and displayed them with great pomp, circumstance and ceremony; and all this, in the estimation of gentlemen and of the Chair, was then perfectly in order.

Distribution Advocated.

From recent intelligence, coming in from all quarters, it is now manifest that we shall have a surplus revenue at the end of the year, independent of the proceeds of the public lands. If then the tariff yields revenue enough, as I doubt not it will, why not distribute the land proceeds among the States, to relieve their people from oppressive taxation? Pennsylvania, sir, owes a debt of forty millions of dollars, contracted in the prosecution of a stupendous, but ill-advised, system of internal improvement equally important to Ohio and the whole West, and hence she had claims for assistance on this Government.

[Mr. McKay said, if she has contracted a debt of forty millions let her pay it!]

Sir, if you withhold her share of the pub-

lic lands, how is she to pay it? Her debt is now increasing, by the addition of two millions annually, on account of interest. She could not pay it by doubling and trebling the present heavy taxation, which now crushes her people to the earth. Yes, double the taxes of Pennsylvania, and it would not pay the interest of her debt, let alone the principal.

As a Pennsylvanian, therefore, I go for the proceeds of the public lands to aid the people of Pennsylvania to pay their debt. Pennsylvania has a clear, legitimate, undoubted right to one-tenth part of the land or its proceeds. The population of Pennsylvania is one tenth part of the population of the Union; and if we were to distribute the land itself to-morrow among the States of this Union, Pennsylvania would get more than one hundred million acres of the public lands. Would not that be an ample fund in the end to pay off the debt of Pennsylvania thrice told? Now, I claim, as a Representative from Pennsylvania, her share of the proceeds of the public lands; and I hope no Representative from Pennsylvania, who looks at the condition of his constituents, crushed under this weight of taxation, of unceasing and increasing taxation, would vote against it. He thought that no gentleman from Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, Louisiana, Alabama, Maryland, Michigan, Mississippi, and other indebted States, some of them more, and others almost as much, indebted as Pennsylvania, in proportion to their population and means, ought, and he hoped none of the Representatives of these States would vote, to withhold from their people their share of the land, and by so doing, rivet taxation on them and their posterity forever. By the terms of the grants or deeds of cession, these lands had been ceded by the States to the Union. And for what? To pay the Revolutionary War Debt. And when that was paid, the lands were to go to the States, including the new States, and those which had made the cessions.

What does this Government want with this fund? It has an abundance of revenue, and if we relieve the people of the States from taxation by giving them what they are entitled to—the proceeds of the public lands—do we not relieve the people of these United States? Do we not relieve the people of this Government from taxation, when we relieve the people of the States from taxation? (For the people of the States and the people of the United States are the same people.)

I submit whether it is not right and fair to relieve the indebted States of this Union from the heavy burden of taxation which is crushing their people, by giving them their share of the proceeds of the public lands. The tariff, so far as it operates as a tax upon the people, is the lightest form, and least felt, inasmuch as the payment is entirely voluntary; but the chief burden of taxation in this form is thrown upon the people of this country upon the foreigner, who is obliged to reduce the profits and the prices of his goods, in order to get them into market, wherever there is an American price established by American labor.

But, sir, there is another argument in favor of distribution—so long as the proceeds of the public lands come into the Treasury of the General Government, we never can have a firm, settled, established revenue policy. The fluctuations in the proceeds of the sales of the lands in past years, varying as they have from less than two millions to upwards of twenty-four millions per annum, if they are suffered to remain in the general Treasury, we must raise and reduce the tariff of the country correspondingly. I would take the proceeds of the lands and give them to the States, if for no other reason than to relieve the Treasury from this unsettled policy, and to give the country a firm and established revenue system.

In 1836, the public lands yielded upwards of twenty-four millions, a sum sufficient to defray all the expenses of Government, and of course creating an immense surplus;—then we heard the cry of "repeal the tariff—down with the tariff—too much revenue." But in two or three years the proceeds of the lands sunk down to less than two millions of dollars; then was raised the cry of "up with the tariff." Thus, so long as the proceeds of the lands, this uncertain and fluctuating source of revenue, goes into the Treasury, nothing can be settled or fixed in the tariff policy of the Government.

I hope, therefore, the representatives of the indebted States will go with me and vote down this bill to repeal the distribution act, and thus relieve their tax-ridden people from the burdens of direct taxation, and at the same time relieve the Treasury from this source of revenue, which unsettles and deranges not only the finances, but the trade and business of the country. Sir, this measure of distribution is equally important to the non-indebted States; they receive an equal proportion of the proceeds of the lands, which could be applied to purposes of education or of improvement, or to whatever the wisdom of their people may direct.

This measure of distribution is a measure of relief to the States, and I now predict that we will have two parties in the country—the "relief party," going for distribution, and the "anti-relief and tax party," going against distribution and for direct taxation. There were only two ways of paying the State debts—Distribution or Taxation; Taxation, unmitigated Taxation. Now, Henceforth and Forever. Which are you for is the question, and gentlemen must meet it. They must either go for distribution and relief, or for taxation and no relief. They have their choice, they must make it and be responsible to the people.

The improvements made by the States, and which had been the great cause of in-

volving them in debt, are highly beneficial to the United States, in connection with the transportation of the mails, the promotion of commerce among the States, and the defence of the country in time of war; and hence, the United States was bound to help pay for them, by giving the proceeds of the public lands.

General Jackson advocated the distribution of the surplus revenue among the States, on this ground. He contends, in his message of 1830, with great truth, that the improvements made by the States, "constitute the surest mode of conferring permanent and substantial benefits on the whole Union." Besides, he contends that the money distributed by the General Government among the States, "would be more judiciously applied and economically expended, under the direction of the State legislatures." Such were some of the arguments urged by General Jackson in favor of this policy, which Mr. Van Buren now denounces as a "preposterous proposition," the mere agitation of which, he says, is disgraceful to the character of the American people, and which his friends on this floor are now voting down, without a word of explanation or debate. What will the illustrious Chief of the Hermitage say to this?

The Whig and Van Buren Systems.

But, sir, we are told that "the Whigs are a party without principles." Sir, are not their principles known and avowed every where? On this subject the Whig system is this: Remove from the National Treasury that disturbing source of revenue, the Public Lands, and give them to the States to which they rightfully belong, to pay their debts, and relieve the people from taxation. Then regulate the Tariff, so as to supply revenue enough for an economical administration of the Federal Government, by imposing protective duties on such articles as we can and ought to supply at home, and revenue duties on luxuries and articles not produced, sufficient to supply the wants of Government. This is the Whig system. Now, sir, what is the Van Buren system? Just the reverse. It is to refuse all relief to the people and the States, by distribution or otherwise; to reduce the Tariff, and let in foreign goods to the destruction of our own industry; exhaust the wealth and currency of the country to pay for them; double the expenses of Government, to enrich office-holders and favorites, and leave the Government again as they left it in 1840, after twelve years administration, impoverished, and overwhelmed with bankruptcies and debts, State and National, amounting to more than two hundred and twenty millions of dollars. How was it, sir, during the twelve preceding years, when Whig policy prevailed? Look at the official reports from the Treasury, and you will find, sir, that during that period we paid off 141 millions of the war debt, expended 12 millions for internal improvements, and left the country with a surplus revenue of more than 12 millions a year, a sound currency and universal prosperity; but in 1842 there came a change. The next twelve years was a period of disastrous experiments, resulting in the excessive increase of banks, the ruin of the currency, the inordinate importation of foreign goods, the consequent destruction of agriculture, manufactures, and the mechanic arts, and the involvement of the States and people in a foreign debt of more than 250 millions, which now hangs like a millstone about their necks. The people could stand it no longer; they determined in 1840 to have a change—to throw off this incubus—but, by an unforeseen event, this was defeated. The period is, however, rapidly approaching when the people will again come to the rescue, and achieve the great object they then had in view.

But we are told, sir, by Mr. Van Buren himself, that this glorious revolution of 1840, was the result of infatuation, folly, and madness, on the part of the people. Sir, is this true? Is it not a foul slander on the American character? Is it not a gross insult to the people, and will it not be so regarded? Sir, that election was the result of a deep and deliberate conviction of the ruinous effects of Mr. Van Buren's policy—effects seen and felt, severely felt, throughout this land. The people saw that nothing but a change—a thorough change—could save the country from hopeless bankruptcy and ruin. That conviction has since been strengthened and confirmed; and the beneficial effects of the Whig tariff of '42, now rapidly restoring the national prosperity, furnishes new and powerful motives to stimulate and strengthen the friends of reform. Sir, if you want evidence, look to the unequivocal indications of public opinion throughout the country. Is not the "handwriting upon the wall," in characters so large and legible that "he who runs may read?" In 1840, the people, by the unprecedented majority of 145,000, pronounced judgment against Mr. Van Buren. Can this be overcome without a change? And where are the changes in his favor? Where is the man who voted against him then, who is for him now? or if there be any such changes, are there not two to one the other way? But, sir, if there were nothing else, the passage of this bill, withholding from the people, in their time of need, their share of the Public Lands, and the attempt to repeal the Tariff of '42, and again inundate the country with foreign goods, break down our own farmers, mechanics, and manufacturers, by the passage of this destructive, anti-American, anti-tariff bill, would of itself be abundantly sufficient to condemn any party, however popular, with a vast majority of the free, enlightened, and patriotic people of this country.

The people will not permit any man, or party of men, long to trample upon their rights and interests with impunity. I know, sir, they have borne much for the sake of party; they have excused bad actions by the ascription of good motives. But there is a point where "forbearance ceases to be a virtue;" that point has been reached and transcended. The people have decided upon a change, and they will have it. They